



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/726,391	12/03/2003	Girma Gebreselassie	998-904DV	5606
20792	7590	04/21/2005	EXAMINER	
MYERS BIGEL SIBLEY & SAJOVEC			OMGBA, ESSAMA	
PO BOX 37428			ART UNIT	
RALEIGH, NC 27627			PAPER NUMBER	
			3726	

DATE MAILED: 04/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

6

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/726,391	Applicant(s) GEBRESELAASSIE ET AL.	
	Examiner Essama Omgba	Art Unit 3726	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 January 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 43-69 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) 59-64 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 65-69 and 5158 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 48 and 50 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 43, 46, 47 and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in view of Nemeto et al. (US Patent 6, 102,465) and Gray (US Patent 5,358,300).

With regards to claim 43, Applicant, at pages 1-4 of the specification to be known as AAPA, discloses a method of installing a vehicle cockpit assembly within a passenger compartment of a vehicle, wherein the passenger compartment is separated from an engine compartment by a firewall, and wherein the passenger compartment comprises a floor wherein an instrument panel is attached to a dash insulator that is configured to be attached to the vehicle firewall. AAPA does not disclose ascertaining acoustic properties of the vehicle to identify portions of the dash insulator requiring sound reflection and/ or absorption, and applying sound reflection and/ or absorption material to identified portions of the dash insulator. However Nemeto et al. teaches applying sound absorption material to portions of a dashboard insulator, see column 4, lines 4-22 and column 9, lines 11-16 and 28-29. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have applied sound absorption materials to portions of the dash insulator of AAPA, in light of the

Art Unit: 3726

teachings of Nemeto et al., in order to improve silence characteristics within the passenger compartment. Although AAPA/Nemeto et al./ does not disclose the dash insulator and the instrument panel being installed within the vehicle as a single unit, however it is known to provide the dash insulator and instrument panel as a modular assembly that can be installed in the vehicle body as an integral unit as attested by Gray, see column 2, lines 42-47 and column 3, lines 54-58. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have provided the dash insulator and instrument panel of AAPA/Nemeto et al. as a single unit to be installed in the vehicle, in light of the teachings of Gray, in order to facilitate the assembly by providing ready access to any portion of the assembly. Applicant should note that it is inherent that acoustic properties of the vehicle would have to be ascertained to identify portions of the dash insulator requiring sound absorption before applying the sound absorption material.

For claims 46 and 47, see column 2, lines 44-65 of Nemeto et al.

For claim 49, Applicant should note that attaching a floor covering to the dash insulator prior to installing the attached dash insulator and instrument panel within the vehicle is an obvious matter of design choice wherein no stated problem is solved or unexpected results obtained in installing the floor covering to the dash insulator prior to installing the attached dash insulator and instrument panel within the vehicle versus attaching the floor covering to the dash insulator after installing the attached dash insulator and instrument panel.

Art Unit: 3726

3. Claims 44 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA/Nemeto et al./Gray as applied to claim 43 above, and further in view of De Winter (US Patent 6,071,619).

AAPA/Nemeto et al./Gray discloses a method of installing a vehicle cockpit assembly within a passenger compartment of a vehicle as shown above except for applying the sound absorption material by spraying polyurethane with different thicknesses to one or more portions of the dash insulator. However De Winter teaches applying polyurethane foam to a dashboard by spraying the foam on the dashboard, see column 6, lines 45-56. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have provided the sound insulation material by spraying urethane foam on the dash insulator of AAPA/Nemeto et al./Gray, in light of the teachings of De Winter, in order to easily de[posit the foam on the substrate. Applicant should note that it is within the general knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art to appropriately provide the sound insulation material on the substrate and also to ascertain the required thickness of sound absorbing material required to provide appropriate sound insulation barrier, see column 4, lines 16-21 and column 9, lines 38-60 of Nemeto et al. for example.

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 48 and 50 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

5. Claims 51-58 and 65-69 are allowed.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 43-47 and 49 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 3726

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Essama Omgba whose telephone number is (571) 272-4532. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (10-7:30) First Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter Vo can be reached on (571) 272-4690. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Essama Omgba
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3726

eo
April 16, 2005